

Application Serial No. 10/551,815
Reply to final office action of March 20, 2009

PATENT
Docket: CU-4443

Remarks and Arguments

Reconsideration is respectfully requested.

Claims 1-2, 4-18 and 20-24 are pending in the present application before this amendment. By the present amendment, claims 1, 5-8, 15, and 20 have been **amended**; claim 18 has been **cancelled**; and new claim 25 has been **added**. No new matter has been added.

In the office action (page 2), claims 1-2, 4-18, and 20-24 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 6,735,572 (Landesmann).

The applicants maintain that Landesmann does not teach each and every element of the present invention as will be described below.

With regard to claim 18, which has been previously amended to include the limitations of claim 19, the examiner maintains the previous rejection. In the office action of September 12, 2007, in rejecting claim 19 (which has been incorporated into claim 18) the examiner alleges that "Landesmann teaches wherein the local keyword is differently selected depending on region with consideration of characteristics of the region [('geographical regions') See column 13, lines 30-45]." The portion of Landesmann cited by the examiner is **completely unrelated** to selecting a local keyword depending on region with consideration of the characteristics of the region.

The examiner points to the same portion of Landesmann in the office action dated March 28, 2008 and again in the office action dated October 02, 2008. In response to the office action dated October 02, 2008, the applicants provided a detailed argument regarding the subject matter of claim 19 that had been incorporated into claim 18.

In addressing this argument (labeled argument #3 by the examiner) in the present office action, the examiner states "it is noted that the features upon which applicant relies (i.e., differently selected depending on region with consideration of characteristics of the region) are not recited in the rejected claim(s)." The applicants respectfully **disagree** and direct the examiner to lines 12-13 of claim 18 as presented in the response dated December 23, 2008, which recite --wherein the local keyword is

Application Serial No. 10/551,815
Reply to final office action of March 20, 2009

PATENT
Docket: CU-4443

differently selected depending on region with consideration of characteristics of the region--.

The applicants respectfully submit that neither col. 13, lines 30-45 of Landesmann (cited by the examiner), nor any other portion of Landesmann teaches -- wherein the local keyword is differently selected depending on region with consideration of characteristics of the region--. The portion of Landesmann cited by the examiner suggests that data may be placed in physically separate databases that could be dispersed, for example, regionally.

Landesmann states that "a single data base may be used, with the personally identifiable data and the buyer purchase data being maintained separate, but not linked" or "alternatively, the data may be placed in physically separate databases" where "the databases could be dispersed regionally" (Landesmann col. 13, lines 24-35). That is, according to Landesmann, a single database could be utilized for data storage, or alternatively, a first database could be located in different location than a second database. This is completely unrelated to the elements of claim 19 that have been incorporated into claim 18, which clearly provides that some keywords among a plurality of keywords are selected as "**local keywords**" that are used to provide local search results related to the searcher's local information, whereas the other non-local keywords provide search results without respect to the searcher's local information. Nowhere in Landesmann teaches --local keywords-- let alone defining local keywords according to characteristics of a region. **Landesmann only teaches dispersing databases in different physical locations** (Landesmann col. 13, lines 30-45)." That is, nowhere in Landesmann teaches that the characteristics of the data within the databases are determined --depending on region with consideration of characteristics of the region--.

As such, this feature has been incorporated into each of claims 1, 15, and 20; and claim 18 has been cancelled without prejudice accordingly. The applicants respectfully submit that each of claims 1, 15, and 20 is now in condition for allowance over the Landesmann reference, because Landesmann simply does not teach --wherein the local keyword is differently selected depending on region with consideration of characteristics of the region--.

Further, claims 1, 15, and 20 are directed to embodiments of a method for

Application Serial No. 10/551,815
Reply to final office action of March 20, 2009

PATENT
Docket: CU-4443

refining Internet search results. The presently claimed invention overcomes problems associated with conventional Internet search engines as described in the background section of the present application. For example, the amount of website information provided to a searcher through the Internet is so massive that it has become very difficult for a searcher to determine how to find the website where the most desirable information is stored among the search results when utilizing a conventional Internet search engine (specification page 1, line 29 to page 2, line 2). The above description clearly show that in the presently claimed invention location information of a searcher is utilized in an Internet search to refine Internet search results.

The applicants respectfully submit that the present invention "refines" Internet search results by utilizing a --a keyword and a first local information-- and arranging at least a part of identified the search items according to the first local information of the searcher when displaying Internet search results. The applicants submit that the Internet search results provided by the presently claimed invention are "refined" because at least a portion thereof are provided not just according to the keyword, but according to the keyword and the --first local information-- of the searcher, and therefore search results are considered more relevant to the searcher.

The applicants have amended claim 1, and similarly claims 15, and 20, to clarify the above features of the present invention as follows: With respect to claim 1, and similarly claims 15, and 20, the applicants have amended claim 1 to clarify the above features as follows:

--A method for refining Internet search results in response to a search request input through a communication network by a searcher utilizing a keyword and a local information of the searcher, the method comprising the steps of:
receiving a first local information from the searcher comprising at least a location information of the searcher related to the searcher;
maintaining the first local information for searching related to the searcher;
receiving a second local information comprising at least a location information of one or more of search items related to a network information provider, wherein each search item corresponds to a web page on the Internet;
maintaining a database including the search items related to the network information provider, wherein some of the search items are related to the keyword of the searcher;
receiving the search request input through an Internet search engine by from the searcher, the search request utilizing both the keyword and the maintained first local information related to the searcher;

Application Serial No. 10/551,815
Reply to final office action of March 20, 2009

PATENT
Docket: CU-4443

identifying at least more than one search item related to the keyword that matches the search request, when the keyword that matches the search request is a local keyword, identifying search items related to the local keyword and selecting the search item related to the second local information matched to the first local information, among the identified search items; and

arranging at least a part of the search items according to a predetermined search item arranging method in arranging the selected search items so as to provide Internet search results according to the first local information of the searcher,

wherein the local keyword is differently selected depending on region with consideration of characteristics of the region.--

Support for the above amendment is found at least in the specification page 11, lines 5-15; and page 9, lines 4-10, thus no new matter has been added.

As amended, it is clear that the presently claimed invention is directed to a method of **refining** Internet search results by arranging search items corresponding to web pages using a --search request input through an Internet search engine by the searcher, the search request utilizing both the keyword and the maintained first local information--.

Nowhere in Landesmann teaches a method of refining Internet search results as claimed above. Landesmann is directed to a system of differential rewards and is completely unrelated to a method of refining Internet search results of the presently claimed invention, as nowhere in Landesmann even teaches a method of searching the Internet for web pages. As shown in FIG. 1 of Landesmann, buyer entity computer systems 10 are connected through a communication network 20 to a buyer-driven processing system 15 (Landesmann col. 12, lines 47-57). Landesmann indicates that the communication network 20 may be the internet; however, Landesmann is absent any teaching of refining Internet search results because the internet in Landesmann merely provides a means for the buyer entity computer systems 10 to communicate with the buyer-driven processing system 15 and nowhere in Landesmann is an Internet search performed.

Landesmann also fails to teach--wherein each search item corresponds to a web page on the Internet--. The examiner alleges in page 2 of the office action that the "search criteria" of Landesmann (i.e., Landesmann col. 20, lines 7-44) teach the claimed --search items-- of the presently claimed invention. However, the "search

Application Serial No. 10/551,815
Reply to final office action of March 20, 2009

PATENT
Docket: CU-4443

criteria" of Landesmann include scores relating to purchase history characteristics, demographic criteria, and other items retrievable on the basis of scores in the database. Nowhere in Landesmann teaches that --each search item corresponds to a web page on the Internet--, because Landesmann does not relate to a method of refining Internet search results. Claim 1, and similarly claims 15, 18, and 20, should be allowable at least because Landesmann does not teach the --search item-- as claimed above.

Landesmann also fails to teach --receiving the search request from the searcher input through an Internet search engine, the search request utilizing both the keyword and the maintained first local information related to the searcher--, as Landesmann is silent as to an Internet search engine.

As the present rejection is under §35 U.S.C. § 102(e), Landesmann must teach each and every element of the presently claimed invention. The applicant respectfully submits that Landesmann fails to teach each and every element of the presently claimed invention at least because Landesmann fails to teach --wherein each search item corresponds to a web page on the Internet-- and --receiving the search request from the searcher input through an Internet Search engine-- as described above. Further, as described above, nowhere in Landesmann even remotely suggests --wherein the local keyword is differently selected depending on region with consideration of characteristics of the region--, because absolutely nowhere in Landesmann teaches a --**local keyword**--. Accordingly, with respect to claims 1, 15, and 20, the applicants respectfully request withdrawal of the aforementioned rejection and earnestly solicit an indication of allowable subject matter.

As to the claims 3-14, 16-17, and 21-24, the applicants respectfully submit that these claims should be allowable at least since they depend from one of claims 1, 15, and 20, which are considered to be in condition for allowance for the reasons above.

Additionally, a new claim 25 has been added. Claim 25 depends from claim 1 and recites:

--wherein the second local information matched to the first local information comprises both the second local information that is in agreement with the first local information and the second local information that is closely related to the first local information.--

Claim 25 is has been directly extracted from the claim 1 (also see original claim 3), thus

Application Serial No. 10/551,815
Reply to final office action of March 20, 2009

PATENT
Docket: CU-4443

no new matter has been added. The applicants respectfully submit that claim 25 should be allowable at least because it depends from claim 1, which is considered to be in condition for allowance for the reasons above.

For the reasons set forth above, the applicants respectfully submit that claims 1-2, 4-17 and 20-25, now pending in this application, are in condition for allowance over the cited reference. Accordingly, the applicants respectfully request reconsideration and withdrawal of the outstanding rejections and earnestly solicit an indication of allowable subject matter. This amendment is considered to be responsive to all points raised in the office action. Should the examiner have any remaining questions or concerns, the examiner is encouraged to contact the undersigned attorney by telephone to expeditiously resolve such concerns.

Respectfully submitted,

Dated: June 19, 2009

Keith S. Van Duyne
Keith Van Duyne, Reg. No. 54,505
Ladas & Parry
224 South Michigan Avenue
Chicago, Illinois 60604
(312) 427-1300